

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

Tyrone Noel Nunn,
Plaintiff

Clark County Detention Center, et. al.,
Defendants

Case No. 2:24-cv-01791-JAD-NJK

Order Dismissing and Closing Case

Plaintiff Tyrone Noel Nunn brings this civil-rights lawsuit to redress constitutional
ons that he claims he suffered while detained at the Clark County Detention Center. On
er 17, 2024, this court ordered Nunn to either pay the \$405 filing fee or file a complete
ation to proceed *in forma pauperis* by December 16, 2024.¹ That deadline expired, and
did not pay the fee or file a complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, but he did
one-page document with 14 cases numbers and the words “*in forma pauperis*.² In light of
ing, I considered meaningful alternatives to dismissal and issued another order granting
one final opportunity to submit a complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* by
ary 10, 2025.³ That extended deadline has expired, and Nunn still has not filed a fully
ete application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, paid the \$405 filing fee, or otherwise
ded.

¹ ECF No. 3.

2 ECF No. 4.

³ ECF No. 5.

1 District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of
 2 that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case.⁴ A
 3 court may dismiss an action based on a party’s failure to obey a court order or comply with local
 4 rules.⁵ In determining whether to dismiss an action on this ground, the court must consider: (1)
 5 the public’s interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court’s need to manage its
 6 docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of
 7 cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.⁶

8 The first two factors, the public’s interest in expeditiously resolving this litigation and the
 9 court’s interest in managing its docket, weigh in favor of dismissal of the plaintiff’s claims. The
 10 third factor, risk of prejudice to defendants, also weighs in favor of dismissal because a
 11 presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in prosecuting an
 12 action.⁷ The fourth factor—the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits—is
 13 greatly outweighed by the factors favoring dismissal.

14 The fifth factor requires the court to consider whether less drastic alternatives can be used
 15 to correct the party’s failure that brought about the court’s need to consider dismissal.⁸ Courts
 16
 17

18 ⁴ *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986).

19 ⁵ *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to
 comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal
 for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

20 ⁶ *In re Phenylpropanolamine Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 460 F.3d 1217, 1226 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting
Malone v. U.S. Postal Serv., 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987)).

21 ⁷ See *Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976).

22 ⁸ *Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier*, 191 F.3d 983, 992 (9th Cir. 1999) (explaining that considering less
 drastic alternatives *before* the party has disobeyed a court order does not satisfy this factor);
 23 *accord Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 643 & n.4 (9th Cir. 2002) (explaining that “the
 persuasive force of” earlier Ninth Circuit cases that “implicitly accepted pursuit of less drastic
 alternatives prior to disobedience of the court’s order as satisfying this element[,]” i.e., like the

1 “need not exhaust every sanction short of dismissal before finally dismissing a case, but must
2 explore possible and meaningful alternatives.”⁹ Because this court cannot operate without
3 collecting reasonable fees, and litigation cannot progress without a plaintiff’s compliance with
4 court orders, the only alternative is to enter a third order setting another deadline. But issuing a
5 third order will only delay the inevitable and further squander the court’s finite resources.
6 Setting another deadline is not a meaningful alternative given these circumstances. So the fifth
7 factor favors dismissal.

8 Having thoroughly weighed these dismissal factors, I find that they weigh in favor of
9 dismissal. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that **THIS ACTION IS DISMISSED** without
10 prejudice based on the plaintiff’s failure to pay the filing fee or seek to proceed in forma pauperis
11 in compliance with the court’s order. The Clerk of Court is kindly requested to **ENTER**
12 **JUDGMENT** accordingly and **CLOSE THIS CASE**. If Tyrone Noel Nunn wishes to pursue
13 his claims, he must file a complaint in a new case, and he must pay the fee for that action or file a
14 complete application to proceed in forma pauperis.

15 Dated: February 25, 2025

16 _____
17 _____
18 _____
19 _____
20 _____
21 _____
22 _____
23 _____
U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey

“initial granting of leave to amend coupled with the warning of dismissal for failure to
comply[,]” have been “eroded” by *Yourish*).

⁹ *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424.